

REMARKS

Claims 1-28, 31-33, and 36-38 are pending in the application. In the Final Office Action dated June 2, 2005, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Rejected claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-19, 25-28, 30-33, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Oracle Forms® Advanced Techniques, ch. 10, pp. 1-18 ("Oracle")*.
- B.) Rejected claims 6, 16, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Francis, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092) ("Francis").
- C.) Rejected claims 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Laverty, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,593) ("Laverty").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner's disposition below.

- A.) Rejection of claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-19, 25-28, 30-33, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Oracle Forms® Advanced Techniques, ch. 10, pp. 1-18 ("Oracle")*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 7-11, 17-19, 25, 26, and 31, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to automatically converting embedded data from a first format, which corresponds to a first program, to a second format that is different from the first format and suitable for use with a second program.

This is clearly unlike *Oracle*, which fails to disclose or suggest automatically converting embedded data from a first format to a second format. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Oracle* fails to disclose or suggest automatically converting embedded data. (*Office Action of 6/2/2005*, page 9). Instead, *Oracle* merely allows a user to manually initiate conversion of an OLE object to a new format by selecting the convert option on the Object submenu of the OLE popup menu. (*Oracle*, page 17). Thus, *Oracle* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 7-11, 17-19, 25, 26, and 31.

Claims 2-5, 12-15, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, and 35 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 11, 26, or 31 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 11, 26, and 31 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

- B.) Rejection of claims 6, 16, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Oracle* in view of *Francis, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,092) (“*Francis*”):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Regarding claims 6 and 16:

Applicants’ independent claims 1 and 11 are allowable over *Oracle* as discussed above. *Francis* still fails to disclose or suggest automatically converting embedded data from a first format, which corresponds to a first program, to a second format when it is determined that the first program is an unavailable program. Referring to *Francis*’s Figure 8, *Francis* analyzes a document to determine whether the document contains Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) elements (step 252). If the document contains HTML elements, then the HTML elements are converted to a Rich Text Format (RTF) stream (steps 258, 262, 268, and 270).

Unlike Applicants’ claims 1 and 11, nowhere does *Francis* disclose or suggest automatically converting embedded data from a first format, which corresponds to a first program, to a second format when it is determined that the first program is an unavailable program. *Francis* makes no such determination. Instead, *Francis* merely converts elements in a document from one format to another, without determining whether a corresponding program is available. Thus, *Oracle* in view of *Francis* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1 and 11.

Claims 6 and 16 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

Regarding claims 20-24:

Applicants’ independent claim 20, as amended, claims automatically converting embedded data when an original program becomes unavailable.

As discussed above with reference to claims 1 and 11, *Oracle* in view of *Francis* fails to disclose or suggest automatically converting embedded data when it is determined that a

program is unavailable. Thus, for at least this reason, *Oracle* in view of *Francis* fails to disclose or suggest claim 20.

Claims 21-24 depend directly or indirectly from claim 20 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 20 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oracle in view of Laverty, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,593) ("Laverty"):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 36-38, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to automatically converting an embedded object, while a document is being loaded into memory, from a first format to a second format when it is determined that a first program corresponding to the first format is unavailable.

As discussed above with reference to claims 1 and 11, *Oracle* fails to disclose or suggest automatically converting an embedded object when it is determined that a program is unavailable. Thus, for at least this reason, *Oracle* fails to disclose or suggest claims 36-38.

Laverty also fails to disclose or suggest automatically converting an embedded object when it is determined that a program is unavailable. Thus, *Oracle* in view of *Laverty* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 36-38.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 2, 2005 By:


Christopher P. Rauch
Registration No. 45,034
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000